

REMARKS

The present response is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 9, 2004, which set a one-month period for response, making this response due by January 9, 2005.

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, restriction to one of the following inventions was required by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 121: Group I, claims 1-5, drawn to a pressure control valve, classified in class 251, subclass 129.14, or Group II, claims 6-8, drawn to a method of manufacturing a pressure control valve, classified in class 264, subclass 239.

The Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-5. This restriction requirement is traversed based on the following grounds.

Claim 1 recites that the fluid channel and the valve chamber are formed on a perform which is injected into a flange. Claim 6 recites that a preform is made, on which the fluid channels and the valve chamber are formed, and then the perform is extrusion-coated with a flange, on which the consumer port and the supply port are formed.


The Applicant respectfully submits that the pressure regulating valve of claim 1 cannot be made in any other method than that of claim 6, because when the perform is extrusion-coated with a flange, then the perform subsequently and inevitably is injected into the flange. The Applicant directs the Examiner's

attention to the specification on page 4, first paragraph, page 6, last paragraph, and page 7, last paragraph, for detailed explanation of the claimed method.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that unity of invention does exist and that the restriction requirement is improper. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this requirement.

If any issues remain to be resolved prior to the substantive examination of this case, please contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700